

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday, 16 March 2016 at 6.00pm in the Telford Suite at
Shropshire College Hotel School Ltd (The Telford Whitehouse Hotel),
Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ**

PRESENT: Councillors C R Turley (Vice-Chair), N A Dugmore, I T W Fletcher, J Loveridge, N C Lowery, S J Reynolds (as substitute for J Minor), P J Scott, and M J Smith.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors S Bentley (for planning application TWC/2015/0999), S P Burrell (for planning application TWC/2015/1059), A J Eade (for planning application TWC/2015/1105), and J M Seymour (for planning application TWC/2015/0438).

PC-091 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 24 February 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

PC-092 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr J Minor

PC-093 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

PC-094 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None

PC-095 SITE VISITS

There were no officer recommendations for a site visit.

Cllr M Smith requested that a site visit took place on planning application TWC/2015/1064 Land east of Queensway HLC, Queensway, Hortonwood, Telford following representations from Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council and the Head of Queensway HLC regarding the access and egress through one route.

The Planning Officers confirmed that there had been no objections from the Highway Authority and the Highways England objections had been withdrawn and that the application as acceptable in its current form. Photographs had been supplied showing the site and issues regarding access. The timing of the application was important due to the application being tied to LEP funding which needed to be spent and occupiers of units had already expressed an interest in coming to the site.

Following the discussion it was put to a vote. Due to a tied vote the Chair used his casting vote and it was:

RESOLVED – that a request for a site visit was refused.

Prior to the next item of business the Planning Officer gave Members a brief update on the recent Appeals Decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate the previous week. The Appeal for 22 dwellings at Mill Lane, Tibberton had been lost. The Appeal against 110 houses in Muxton Lane had been won. A Public Inquiry had been undertaken on this application which included cross-examination and a thorough debate. This being the case it was considered that a steer would be taken from this outcome as it was up-to-date and robust and showed the Council to have in excess of 10 years housing land supply. Policy CS7 was up-to-date and compliant with the NPPF. With regard to Policy H10a this was not NPPF compliant and it was considered that Policy H9 of the Wrekin Local Plan, relating to rural settlements, was also out of date. Policy CS7 was considered less restrictive and was found to be compliant with the NPPF. The Council were in a good position with regards to the housing land supply and the Inspector found that there was no need to amend development boundaries on an ad hoc basis. The Planning Officer felt that the Planning Inspector's recent decision on the Muxton Lane Application following the public inquiry was helpful to the Council.

PC-096 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2015/1064, TWC/2015/0999, TWC/2015/1059 and TWC/2015/1105.

- (a) TWC/2015/0438 - Land North of Dunelm, Rodington Heath, Telford, Shropshire

This proposal sought Reserved Matters consent for the erection of six dwellings on land sited north of Dunelm in the village of Rodington Heath. Councillor J M Seymour, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. An outline application had previously been approved by Members for 2 semi-detached and 4 detached dwellings. The principle had been approved prior to the Council establishing a 5 year housing land supply and the reserved matters application had come forward within the relevant time period and therefore the Committee were unable to reconsider the principle.

Councillor D Johnson, Rodington Parish Council, spoke in opposition of the application which had received numerous objections due to lack of amenities and public transport, the state of the roads when it was passed at the committee at the outline stage. The application had a provision for 2 affordable homes and concern was raised that due to an application that had already been granted for 5 affordable homes on application TWC/2014/0484 that this would cause an over provision of affordable housing. Cllr Johnson suggested that if the 2 affordable plots were

removed from the application that only 4 dwellings were built of higher specification that this would alleviate the concerns of local residents.

Councillor Seymour spoke to oppose the proposal that had regrettably been approved in March 2015 only a few days prior to the Council confirming they had a 5 year housing land supply. Cllr Seymour thanked all parties for their negotiations to try and reach a compromise prior to the reserved matters stage on the layout and the design of the scheme. Residents were still concerned about the complete disregard for the impact of the development on Dunelm with Plot 4 being to the front which would dominate the bedroom and the sun lounge of Dunelm and affect its privacy. Rodington Parish Council had undertaken a Housing Needs Survey on application TWC/2014/0484 which was for 14 dwellings near to the centre of the village and had an element of affordable housing and there was concern that these two applications would undermine the local letting plan and prevent it from working properly. If the affordable housing element was withdrawn from this application then the remaining 4 dwellings could be spaced along the building line and improve the design of the site.

Mr R Evans, local resident, who opposed the application, addressed the Members regarding concerns of residents who felt that they had not been consulted and listened to. Concerns were raised regarding drainage as the garden land was lower than the field, the new soakaway and the impact the extra houses would have. It was felt that Dunelm would lose its view and its privacy. A compromise had tried to be reached and if plots were removed a better layout could be achieved with individual houses being larger and more in keeping with the buildings in the countryside and the building line and the privacy for Dunelm being returned. Concerns with regard to the traffic were also raised with 30-40 contractors trucks per day that would need to drive in the middle of the road to secure access. Mr Evans asked that Members refuse the application on the grounds of privacy, drainage and density.

The applicant, Mr P Sankey, addressed the Committee in support of the proposals and explained to Members that this was an important small development of attractive high quality dwellings which would benefit the village. Mr Sankey had worked with the Planning Officer and held meetings with residents and had fulfilled the planning requirements. Local concerns were of paramount importance and the layout reached was the best use of the land whilst allowing for the tree protection zones and the building lines which followed the main road and maximised the site within the constraints. The distance had increased in size to 3-4 metres within the site and the drainage and ground seepage was not an issue as there was adequate land drainage to take away surplus water on the property which drained into the river Roden. The dwellings had been designed and amended to take on a more rural appearance and had broken up the large walls facing the highway with additional windows. Two affordable houses were part of the application and affordable renting within the village was important for local people who could not afford to buy.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that the outline application for 6 units had already been approved and that they only needed to consider the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development which was on the edge of the open countryside but reinforced the rural area. Discussions had taken place with neighbours and the officers were satisfied that there was adequate separation of the properties. The proposed layout did respect the building line as there was no distinct

building line and minor amendments to the development included additional windows, a reduction to the height of the garages, inclusion of chimneys and attractive gable ends. There was a mix of properties and Tree Officers and Highways safety had no objections. This was a reserved matters application and the affordable housing had been approved as part of the outline permission and members were informed that the development was acceptable and met the criteria of the Local Plan and was of good design.

A discussion took place and concerns were raised whether the buildings were out of character and if this was a ribbon style development. The effect of Plot 4 on Dunelm was also a concern together with the design and layout. Consideration was also given to whether the application was overdevelopment of the site. Outline permission had already been granted and Members were reluctant to reduce the allocation of affordable housing.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0438 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to Grant Reserved Matters Consent subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

(b) TWC/2015/0999 - Land adjacent Crown Farm & Swift Barn, Kynnersley, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline application for including details of access for the erection of two two-storey detached dwellings and detached garages on land adjacent to Crown Farm Barns and Swift Barn, Kynnersley. All other matters relating to appearance, layout, landscaping and scale were reserved for future determination. Kynnersley Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

The Planning Officer confirmed to Members that this application was not a rural settlement under the Wrekin Local Plan, or in the core strategy and was not in the emerging Local Plan as it lacked basic services. The Parish Council were in support of the application, 8 letters of objection had been received and 1 letter of support. An update report was tabled at the meeting giving a point of clarification from the Parish Council, but the Officer recommendation remained the same to refuse the application in accordance with rural housing policies and the character and setting of the village.

Cllr S Bentley spoke in support of the application which he considered was a sound outline application. The concerns of residents ie about the access would be addressed. On a previous application the Inspector had stated that Policies H9 and H10 were not sound reasons for refusal and Policy CS7 did not preclude dwellings in a settlement. There were 3 key elements for settlements within the NPPF which were a sustainable development, on a brownfield site and in the centre of a village. With regards to sustainability, a village needed a Church, a school and a shop. Although this village did not have a school, it did have a church and a shop and the Members were asked to consider the points in paragraph 7.2 of the committee report

(that appropriate designed dwellings could be achieved and the site was able to accommodate two dwellings) and to use the Policy correctly.

Mrs H Mitchell, local resident, spoke against the application on behalf of the neighbours who had given objections on the design and access statement of the plans. The Council now had a 10 year housing land supply. The proposed development was on the edge of the boundary and a bus service was limited to a Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday which meant a car was required daily. A total of 6 on-site parking spaces had been proposed and which would put additional pressure on the access and add additional traffic to the roads. The village shop held a temporary permission and was housed in a shed. The future of the village hall was uncertain and the Church only had 4 Parishioners and held shared services during the summer months. Mrs Mitchell welcomed the 10 year housing land supply and asked member to refuse the application.

The applicant's agent, Mr G Davies, addressed the Committee in support of the proposals for 2 dwellings on a brownfield site in the centre of the village. Mr Davies considered that the reasons for refusal were contrary to policy and that Telford and Wrekin Local Plan had limited weight to determining the application. Policy CS7 focussed around main settlements and allowed for limited housing within this site. A similar application had been approved in 2014 and this had been considered acceptable and justified as the Council did not have a 5 year housing land supply. One dwelling was considered to be in a sustainable location through the NPPF. Although the Council now had a 5 year housing land supply, this did not change the precedent set previously. This development was suitable as an infill application under Policy CS7 and gave a visual improvement on the land and had the full support of the Parish Council.

The Planning Officers addressed Members that this area had never been a chosen settlement within the Wrekin Local Plan and Core Strategy and was not deemed a suitable sustainable settlement in the emerging Telford & Wrekin Local Plan and it was not listed in Policy HO10. This development would not boost the economy or be sustainable.

A discussion took place and Members felt that the Local Plan should be used as guidance as much as possible whilst considering applications. This was not a key settlement and was not in a sustainable location and the shop was on a temporary basis. The Council now had a 10 year housing land supply and this development went against Policy. Although Members wished to see the site improved, there were no exceptional circumstances on which to go against policy.

The Planning Officer asked, following the announcement at the start of the meeting, that the reasons for refusal as set out in the report be approved with the deletion of references to Policy H9.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0999 that outline planning permission be unanimously refused for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that Kynnersley is not a suitable settlement identified to receive housing in Policies, CS7 of the Core Strategy or HO10 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan. The proposed site is not considered to be in a sustainable location for residential development; given it is not located in one of the identified settlements and there is a lack of convenient access to services, facilities and employment. The proposal also fails to address the three tests of sustainable development as set out in national policy. The proposed development does not represent an exceptional circumstance to warrant a departure from policy. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS7 and CS9 of the Core Strategy, and Policies SP 3, SP 4 and HO10 of the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan.

(c) TWC/2015/1059 - Wellbank Villa, Pickstock, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8AH

This was an application seeking full planning permission for the erection of a single storey building for use as an educational facility (use class D1) together with retrospective consent for the siting of three Shepherds Huts for overnight accommodation and the extension and conversion of an existing stable block to provide showers, toilets and facilities such as a lounge and kitchen. Councillor S P Burrell, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. An update report was tabled at the meeting which gave clarification on the use of the buildings, a better location plan and photographs which had been taken by a neighbour. To the rear of the shepherds units a toilet had been installed and as this was not part of the application this would need to be removed. Officers were recommending a 2 year temporary permission to allow development to operate and be assessed.

Councillor Burrell spoke against the application and asked Members to consider a site visit prior to determination of this application. There was no regular bus service to this development and a car would need to be used. The lane was a single track of approximately 2 miles length and a refusal on an earlier application, TWC/2015/0925, had been given due to the parking arrangements and there being no on-street parking. This was not just an application for an Education facility but for events, weddings, parties and glamping part of which was under construction or had been completed. Cllr Burrell was concerned regarding the inconsistencies outlined within the application and the lack of a comprehensive base of evidence.

The Applicant, Mr D Eggerton, addressed the Committee in support of the proposals. He had been fortunate to have been living and embracing country living and had worked on his smallholding for almost 10 years. This smallholding was also Mr Eggerton's home and he wanted likeminded people to be able to enjoy the countryside. The aim was for small groups of people to learn about the and better understand and respect the countryside. It was not Mr Eggerton's intention to upset his neighbours and the events would be tasteful and would be policed by him personally and anybody causing trouble would not be welcomed back. Mr Eggerton welcomed a site visit, restrictions and a temporary period of time.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there were no highway objections regarding the on-site parking. The location and proposed development would be self-regulating to some extent and there were no issues regarding the siting of the structures which were next to existing buildings. There was no encroachment into the countryside and no visual blight. Main issues to be considered were the unknown elements, although some could be undertaken for 28 days under permitted development. Conditions such as a 2 year temporary permission, restrictions on use, hours of operation ie 9pm finish could make the development more acceptable.

Members discussed the application and its admirable aims as they considered new ventures deserved to have a chance and although there were some reservations regarding the events, the number of students, the parking and the inconsistencies within the application. Members raised whether a site visit should take place and a vote took place. Following the vote it was agreed that no site visit should take place.

Following the discussion it was:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/1059 that planning permission be granted for a temporary two year period, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

(d) TWC/2015/1064 - Land east of Queensway HLC, Queensway, Hortonwood, Telford, Shropshire

This was a joint application by the Council and the Homes and Communities Agency in two parts:-

- Part A was an outline proposal for the construction of an employment park comprising of up to 54,404 sq m of general industrial / warehouse and distribution floorspace (Use Classes B2 and B8) with ancillary floorspace comprising offices, retail, restaurant/café and hot food take away (Use Classes B1, A1, A3 and A5) with all matters reserved except for the means of access to the site. A variety of uses had been applied for to provide flexibility for the marketing and future detailed development of the site.
- Part B was a full application for the construction of two general industrial / warehouse and distribution units with ancillary office accommodation (Use Classes B2, B8 and B1) along with infrastructure works including access and the internal estate road, drainage, earthworks and strategic landscaping for the whole of the site. The two units that were included within this part of the application were Unit 9 (that would measure 6,400 sq m) and Unit 10 (that would measure 3,156 sq m). As occupiers had been identified for these units which was why this part of the application was submitted in full.

The Planning Officer informed Members that this application formed part of a larger proposal by the Marches LEP and funded through the Local Growth Fund which included new homes and jobs for Telford and Wrekin and improvements to junctions to and the dualling of the A442. A total of 23 letters of objection had been received and included subjects such as increased traffic, lack of information, size of the building and the separation distances, loss of agricultural land and the impact on the

traffic bottle-neck. There were no technical issues to withhold planning permission. Highways England had now withdrawn their objection with conditions which included an imposed transport assessment, limit to the floor space of units 9 and 10 and a traffic and travel plan. An update report was tabled which included a last minute letter from the Queensway HLC Centre around the traffic route, access, signage, traffic calming measures and secured school gates. Contributions of £540,919 for part A of the application and £10,000 for the implementation of the Travel Plan would need to be submitted as part of the proposed development. The key issues for Members to consider were the principle of development and the policy conflict, the strategic allocation, the boost to the local economy, the layout and design of the development, access and S106 contributions.

Mr D Hyde spoke on behalf of Horton Action Group to oppose the proposals on the grounds that this development was outside of the Local Plan and the environmental impact on the wildlife. Further concerns were the size of the buildings and missing critical information, the possible 200-400 vehicle movements per day per unit, the entrance to the development near to the HLC Queensway School entrance, road safety and access on the A442. Mr Hyde considered that the existing traffic lights were a well-known congestion site and that further traffic control may create “rat runs” and increase the number of accidents by 4 fold. He also felt that the application was being “rushed” and that there had been no great concern or sensitivity given to local residents and that this was not in keeping with the ethos of Telford. Telford was a great place to live and do business and had good transport links and concerns were raised on the impact that this development would have.

The applicant’s agent, Mr P Ellingham, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the proposals which sought consent for the business park at Hortonwood which involved a portfolio of sites between the HCA and Telford and Wrekin Council. The application had been through a pre-application process and a formal public consultation exercise had taken place on the site master plan and the School had been fully engaged. There had been a series of changes made to the basis of the application including an increase set-off distance from the northern boundary and a reduction in the height of the buildings. A bund and acoustic fencing to the west of the site near to the School had also been introduced. There were now occupiers expressing an interest in the first phase of development of units 9 and 10. A dialogue had taken place with Highways regarding the reworking the access at Queensway who had proposed a condition that the movements be monitored and controlled. The development of Unit 10 was being funded utilising the Council approved capital fund of £20m and would safeguard 28 jobs and create a further 17 jobs and for Unit 9, a private development, would safeguard 68 jobs and create a further 25 more. There were no technical matters to refuse the application and there were relevant planning conditions proposed. Mr Ellingham asked Members to grant permission on the application.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that the application was outline permission for part A of the application was sought and the indicative layout would not be finalised until the subsequent reserved matters application. Part B which referred to Units 9 and 10 was for full permission and members were asked to consider the design and appearance of the development and the access and impact on the A442. There had been initial concerns with regards to the design of Unit 9 in particular as

this lacked visual interest. An improved design had been submitted which included glazing and contrasting cladding and this was now considered satisfactory. With regard to height parameters, Units 1 and 2 would be no more than 8 metres, the sites at the centre of the development would be conditioned between 15-18 metres. The plans had been amended to include a 40 metre distance separation with a 3 metre high bund with landscaping and acoustic fencing to the western boundary. Conditions would be imposed requiring noise details of known occupiers for subsequent reserved matters in due course. A noise assessment, together with other parameters were planned such as distance separation, conditions and the bund and as the site was flat and there were mature hedgerows this would ensure that residential properties were not adversely affected. As this was currently a large area of employment land this application would not be a new feature but an extension of that which already existed nearby. The Weald Moors was over 1 kilometre away so distance separation was not an issue and the presence of an additional site was not felt would be of detrimental visual impact on the surrounding area. This development was considered to be of strategic need through the LEP and in conjunction with the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan as an employment allocation and on planning balance was of social and economic benefit. The Planning Officer asked Members to approve the application subject to the conditions contained in the report and the update report and the S106.

Members discussed the application and although this application should have been good inward investment and an extension to the industrial estate and the creation of up to 1,000 jobs, which was welcomed, through public consultation and residents views various concerns were highlighted which included:

- No pedestrian access
- No laybys for stationery traffic
- Proposed improvements for the junctions ie Pools Island
- Volume of traffic / bottle-neck
- Control of noise
- Loss of high quality agricultural land
- Detrimental effect on the local area
- Alternative employment sites
- The figures within the report

Members raised further concerns with regard to the introduction of another junction along the A442 with 2 access ways, one in close proximity to the Queensway HLC School. The Members asked if there would be scope to change the plans for a single access which would take the traffic and large lorries away from the school.

The Planning Officer explained to Members that the Highways Officers and Highways England had no objections to the application and that this development would be linked with highway improvements and the widening and dualling of the A442 together with signalised junctions and that there was no technical justification to refuse the application or to seek to get this access changed. The access off the A442 would be shared but the school complex was a gated complex. The Highways Officers had looked at traffic modelling and traffic movement at their worst case scenarios together with an analysis of the highway network and traffic and the

access arrangement was considered to be acceptable. Proposed conditions to the development would include widening of the road, traffic calming and signage.

The Development Manager Service Delivery Manager addressed the Members and explained that the LEP funding bid was to improve the whole of this highway corridor as part of a wider scheme to improve the A442 and that the Highways Engineers had requested 2 separate accesses. It would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on highway grounds if this application went to appeal and the Council could be at risks of costs being awarded against them.

Following the discussion it was formally moved and seconded that the application be deferred. Upon being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/1064 that the application be deferred in order to look at access options that avoid use of the access road off the A442 that passes the Queensway HLC school.

(e) TWC/2015/1105 - Former Builders Yard, Barrack Lane, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the erection of one dwelling and garage with all matters reserved for future determination. The application was a resubmission of an application previously refused by the Committee on 16 September 2015.

The Planning Officer addressed the members that Lilleshall was not identified on the Core Strategy. The development was within an area with a good range of facilities in a sustainable location. It was a discreet and screened parcel of land that did not encroach into the countryside and was within a rural area. The site was suitably accessed but was currently in an untidy state and a single dwelling would improve its appearance.

Councillor A J Eade, Ward Member, spoke to oppose the application on the grounds similar to the last refusal which were it was an extension into the open countryside, there would be an unsightly bund and acoustic fence, damage to flora and fauna and was contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy which was considered up-to-date. This was not a key settlement and the application was not suitable as an infill site. Policy H9 and H10 had been used to justify the development, but Policy H9 had been replaced by CS7 and this was clearly not an infill plot under Policy H10 or did not protect the Lilleshall Gap which was protected countryside within the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan. Cllr Eade considered that the Planning Inspector's decision relating to Application W95/0644 tabled within the update report was not applicable due to the length of that had elapsed since the decision over 20 years ago and that farming was most likely to be different now. Cllr Eade felt that Policy OL6 was there to protect the countryside and this Policy had not been considered within the report.

Mr P Hill, a neighbouring resident, also spoke in opposition to the application as the development would still be situated next to a farm which would be affected by noise and smell and would not be protected by the use of a vegetative buffer. This was not a brownfield site and did not fulfil criteria. The area was not considered to be countryside but within woods to the north and fields and a footpath running along

open gates to the south of Haughton Canal. Mr Hill raised concerns regarding the building and the unsociable hours, the cost of infilling mines which would be uneconomic and could cost up to half a million pounds, the effect of flies, muck and noxious smells on a property which was located so close to a farm together with antisocial hours of work and any residents being unable to use the garden during the day.

The applicant's agent, Mr A Williams, addressed the Committee in support of the proposals which were outline with all matters reserved for 1 dwelling. This development was much further away from the previous application and it needed to be carefully reviewed on its merits. Mr Williams recommended to Members that this application be approved and brought Members attention to paragraphs 6.8-6.11 of the report. Policy CS7 focussed on names settlements although this did not preclude "limited" development within the local plan on a small and acceptable scale. The development was a former builders yard and it was not greenfield and not screened and not in woodland, separate from the agricultural land beyond and not an extension into the countryside. An odour and pest assessment had been endorsed by the Council's Environmental Health Officers and there was an indicative layout. There were no justifiable reasons to refuse. The right of way was a private matter and did not form part of the application.

The Planning Officer suggested to Members that following the Muxton Lane appeal that Policies H9 and H10 at paragraph 7.2 to the report be deleted and removed from the officer recommendations. The development site was on a commercial site and was not in open countryside, so Policy OL6 was not applicable and as it was only a single dwelling it was not a detrimental change to the landscape in the Lilleshall Gap. There were a number of other dwellings were in close proximity to the farm.

A discussion took place and Members raised concerns regarding the large sinkhole that had appeared near to the site and what lay beneath the development land. Other concerns raised were with regard to strong odour from the farm and whether this development was at a suitable distance away. The development had previously been refused as being contrary to CS1, CS3, CS7, CS15 and UD2 and Members could see no reason why this application should be granted.

The Planning officer advised Members that there were conditions requiring further intrusive ground investigation works before a reserved matters application could be submitted. The legal advisor and the Development Manager Service Delivery Manager explained to Members that, where a concern could be addressed by an appropriate planning condition, that concern could not be a reasonable ground for refusal. Extra conditioning work would need to be undertaken prior to any development taking place on the site.

Following the discussion it was

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC.2015/1105 that outline planning permission be unanimously refused for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposal is outside the settlements of High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton where new development is to be focussed. The proposal would not be suitable infill development so would result in unacceptable extension of the village into countryside. Furthermore, the close proximity of New House Farm would have a harmful impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the proposed dwellings. Accordingly, the proposal was contrary to Core Strategy policies CS1, CS3, CS7, CS15 and Wrekin Local Plan saved policy UD2.

The meeting ended at 8.19 pm

Chairman:

Date: